Dear Jim, re NYTimes series on CIA/publishing 12/28/77

As I was reading the Crewdson series in the Times beginning 12/25 it appeared that there are some facts we might be able to use in FOIA matters.

12/25: the CIA embellishes and distorts, as with the Khruschev speech, the words and the illustration of the article.

AP, re injunction request, "estimates that its dispatches alone reach half the world's population in some form."

Barron's book was a CIA job, as the content made obvious. It "has assisted authors with books that it felt might serve some operational purpose...One such case was the agency's decision to cooperate with John Barron in his research on a recent book about the Soviet K.G.B. ..." As I told you its content was from the CIA and relating to 1448 is a series of stories about defectors, the kind of information it claims it has to withhold in the litigation. Note that the Archives has never responded to my asking if the withheld information is or is not included in CIA releases subsequent to its review."

12/26: Whatever the explanation, here the Times and Crewdson say less about book publishing than has been published. One not mentioned is liberal Luce, then publisher of the New Republic. (Which I think also worked with them.)

Bohemia and Inter-American Press are mentioned as CIA supported. Both figure in the JFK assassination story. Bohemia printed pure propaganda that had Castro killing JFK and Inter-American did the equivalent, giving a forum to such as the Carbos of the Cuban lunatic edge. This means CIA did it. Their people did.

12/27: Ditto for their Hal Hendrix, of whom this story says much less than is public, like leaving out his ITT connection, did air the insane Cuban fabrications about Oswald and about Castro being the JFK assassin. I think the late Jules DuBois figured in similar stories. He also was a CIA type. I think also in IPA

Also in the issue of the 27th is an obit of William Langer. I draw yourattention to what it says in the second column, not mentioned in the obit in today's Post - that he drew upon classified documents in his book supporting the official US position of support for the Vichy french while opposing De. Faulle. Charles Beard objected to such "special favors." This is another case of there being no classification when there is perceived political objective.

So it is that Langer came to have a copyright on the classified official information that was not made available to others.

My opinion is that the Times had some official help in these dramatically underwritten stories so everyone else could appear worse than the Times, whose CIA service was exposed earlier. With this being the grist of the current Congressional mill it will also appear to Times readers that the Times exposed what the Congress then investigated. I'd be surprised if they did not inform the Times as much as possible.